

Action Item

California Postsecondary Education Commission

Approval of the Minutes of the July 22, 2002, Meeting

MINUTES

California Postsecondary Education Commission

Meeting of July 22, 2002

**Commissioners
present** Alan S. Arkatov *Chair*
Carol Chandler, *Vice Chair*
Susan Hammer
Lance Izumi
Odessa P. Johnson
Evonne Seron Schulze
Rachel E. Shetka
Olivia K. Singh
Anthony M. Vitti
Howard Welinsky

**Commissioner
absent**
Irwin S. Field
Kyo "Paul" Jhin
Guillermo Rodriguez, Jr.
Melinda G. Wilson

Call to order Following closed session for discussion of personnel matters, Commission Chair Arkatov called the Monday, July 22, 2002, California Postsecondary Education Commission meeting to order at 2:42 p.m. in Room 437 of the California State Capital in Sacramento, California. He asked for a call of the roll.

Call of the roll Executive Secretary Judy Harder called the roll. All Commissioners were present except Irwin S. Field, Kyo "Paul" Jhin, Guillermo Rodriguez, Jr, and Melinda Wilson.

**First order of
business as
determined by the
Chair** Chair Arkatov thanked those who had been waiting patiently for the conclusion of the closed session. He expressed the excitement of the Commission on the leadership of Interim Executive Director Robert Moore and concern about the impact of the State budget on the Commission, leading to a number of staff departures. He expressed his confidence that the Commission "would help right this ship."

Consent calendar Chair Arkatov asked for a motion to approve the following:

Item 10: Minutes of May 20, 2002 Special meeting;
Item 11: Minutes of June 3, 2002 Executive Committee meeting;
Item 12: Minutes of June 3-4, 2002 meeting;
Item 13: Minutes of June 11, 2002 Special meeting;
Report of the Governmental Relations Committee;

Report of the Fiscal Policy and Analysis Committee; and
Report of the Educational Policy and Programs Committee.

The motion was made by Commissioner Schulze, seconded by Commissioner Izumi, and carried unanimously.

**Report of the
Statutory Advisory
Committee**

Chair Arkatov then asked for the report of the Statutory Advisory Committee. Todd Greenspan, chair of the committee, reported that members of the Statutory Advisory Committee had met the preceding Tuesday, July 16, and reviewed items for this agenda and potential items for the next two meetings. The committee also discussed how it could assist the Commission in its reassessment and serve as a proactive, rather than reactive, vehicle of review. The members propose to discuss ideas in this regard with Interim Executive Director Moore. Mr. Greenspan concluded by summarizing activities of interest in each of the segments.

**Report of the
Executive Director**

Chair Arkatov next turned to Mr. Moore for the director's report. Mr. Moore explained that he would be discussing the most recent draft of the Master Plan for Education - Kindergarten through University, particularly those parts of the report dealing with coordination, planning, and data collection. He advised the Commissioners that he would focus on the first few pages and then Recommendations 39, 40, and 41. But first, he reminded the Commission of his commitment to the Department of Finance to reassess the Commission's roles and responsibilities and that he would be working with the segments and the staff to set priorities and to look more closely at what it is that we can do to have more value to the people of the State of California.

The Master Plan document is currently undergoing some interesting and varied critiques, Moore stated. Those who work with the Legislature tend not to say anything negative about it, while others view it as a document in which rhetoric often outweighs substance. Of the 153 recommendations in the current report, few pertain to higher education, with the majority focusing on K-12 education. A major question in Director Moore's eyes is how we can better connect postsecondary education to K-12 education to provide the best learning opportunities. He referred the Commissioners to the report's table of contents that divides the report into issues of access, achievement, accountability, and affordability and reminded them of the revised Master Plan's vision for California's educational system, found on page four.

One of the dilemmas presented by the document as a whole, Mr. Moore observed, is its seeming lack of coherence. It contains many good ideas but exhibits little recognition of what is already being done in education or any questioning of what really works. "It is as if the document was put together without any recognition of things done in education over the last 30 years, including those efforts currently being pursued," he noted. It is his understanding that the Regents are also perturbed because the draft makes it seem as though nothing is working which, he commented, is "an absolute fallacy." He referred to a report done by the Commission nearly 20 years ago, called *Promises To Keep*. The Community College Board of Governors is currently revisiting that report, and one of the participants remarked that soon we might be able to issue a report called *Promises*

Kept. This is a case in point that it takes time for things to happen in education. You have to have a vision, you have to take steps to implement that vision, and you have to have a means to evaluate it. But people want to have things happen now. Over time, one idea after another is put forward but with little consistency between and among them. “This agency can play a critical role in bringing coherence to what must happen for good planning and coordination primarily in postsecondary education,” he stated. While K-12 education has the State Board of Education for policy setting and the California Department of Education with responsibility for planning and review, these entities have perhaps not focused their existing resources and talents so that coordination might occur. He promised that for the October meeting he would have some very specific recommendations to achieve better planning and coordination for postsecondary education.

Mr. Moore then quickly referred to a number of recommendations in the Master Plan in which the Commission has an interest. The issue that has gotten the most attention is adult education, about which the Commission may comment. Recommendation 9 addresses faculty preparation and development. Recommendation 10 pertains to part-time/full-time faculty and, as written, may lead to too many State mandates in an area where quality, rather than number, is the paramount issue. Recommendation 11 stresses competitive compensation that may conflict with the concept of merit. Here too, quality should be issue number one.

Commissioner Johnson then distributed a letter from University of California President Richard Atkinson to Senator Dede Alpert, chair of the K-16 Master Plan Joint Committee, laying out the University’s response to the draft Master Plan. She asked Interim Director Moore if she were correct in understanding that the Commission would have a more detailed discussion of the Master Plan in October. He noted that the Master Plan draft would be adopted by the end of August. Discussion could still occur, however, as the Master Plan would still remain a framework for future legislation. Chair Arkatov suggested that the Commissioners might have a discussion about the Master Plan, using a listserv on the web; the Commissioners were advised that such communication was prohibited as a serial meeting under the Bagley-Keene and the Brown Acts. Mr. Moore assured the Commissioners that he would look for ways in which information could be shared. Mr. Moore requested the Commission’s blessing to respond to the draft immediately, with further discussion to occur at the October meeting.

Upon Commissioner’s Hammer’s suggestion, Mr. Moore focused the Commissioners’ attention on the recommendations in the Master Plan pertaining to the Commission itself. Recommendation 39 calls for the reconstitution of the Commission as the California Education Commission with responsibility for planning, coordination, and analysis from preschool through postsecondary education. He explained that such a recommendation did not arise from the Working Group on Governance, of which Commissioner Schulze was a member. Commissioner Schulze confirmed that the Working Group roundly rejected such a notion. Commissioner Johnson then mentioned Director Moore’s memo regarding the composition of the current Postsecondary Education Commission, in which he states that segmental representation should not dominate the Commission. Commissioner Johnson pointed out that five members out of 16 could not be

defined as domination. Vice Chair Chandler clarified that segmental representatives could not take a leadership position nor serve on the Executive Committee of the Commission. Further discussion occurred, with agreement that if the work the Commission sets out to do has merit, it will meet no resistance from the Administration and the Legislature will support our efforts.

Mr. Moore called upon the Commissioners to be most outspoken about Recommendation 40 that recommends the establishment of “an objective, independent entity as the statewide education data repository.” He stated that the Commission’s Information Systems staff had put together a very effective data gathering, storage, and distribution process and had worked with the California Department of Education to ensure data sharing. For the Master Plan staff to come forward with the idea that the Commission’s work in this area is lacking in any significant respect could be considered offensive. Commissioner Hammer suggested that it was an idea born of ignorance. Vice Chair Chandler asked how the Commission might better relay its message about the efficacy of its work. Director Moore replied that there would be ample opportunities and that he would be contacting Commissioners individually and keeping all of them advised. He is inquiring about the Commission making presentations at the orientation for new legislators. In response to Chair Arkatov’s reference to the legislative profiles traditionally prepared by Commission staff, Mr. Moore stated that similar profiles would be prepared for all candidates for legislative office and that the Commission would be very proactive very quickly. Commissioner Hammer advised that the Commission avoid a defensive tone and rather comport itself as a positive partner. Director Moore commented that he was a great believer that how you said something was sometimes more important than what you said. Commissioner Hammer suggested that a letter be sent from Chair Arkatov to the Master Plan Joint Committee with the Commission’s views about the draft Master plan. Mr. Moore proposed that such a letter be transmitted over the Executive Director’s signature instead. Chair Arkatov asked for a motion to allow the Director to respond to the draft Master Plan. The motion was made by Commissioner Welinsky and seconded by Commissioner Hammer; the motion passed unanimously.

Adjournment Having no further business, Chair Arkatov adjourned the meeting at 3:22 p.m.
